

REMARKS

The Examiner has pieced together four different patents and has tried to combine a segment of each reference in order to come up with the device of applicant. The Examiner fails to take into consideration that the bicycle of *Molina* is a mobile bicycle; it is intended to be ridden, and is not a fixed unit to be utilized strictly for power to be derived from the rear wheel.

The generator attached to the bicycle wheel of *Cheng-Yon* is also intended to make the bicycle go faster and more easily; this, again, is a mobile vehicle. The generator system of the bicycle of *Cheng-Yon* is intended to operate lights or turn signals or some other aspect of a moving bicycle. The attention of the Examiner is turned to column 1, lines 25 thru 43. The reader's attention is also directed to column 2, lines 58 et seq which states, "*The preferred embodiment ... may be incorporated in a variety of scenarios, particularly the rotation of a bicycle wheel hub that triggers power generation to light up a bicycle headlight.*" Clearly, such generation is inadequate to possibly charge up a series of batteries as is the ultimate goal of applicant's apparatus.

The *Olsen* invention is used to make the art of bicycle riding uphill a bit easier. It is the power assist that is touch control to handle the engagement and disengagement of the little motor to the bicycle wheel. As is noted in the abstract, the invention enables the power delivered to the bicycle tire to boost the capability of the cyclist climbing hills during a one to two hour bicycle ride. The clutch of the system has no bearing or recognition or use in the system of applicant.

It appears that the *Olsen* device is a badly powered motor with a drive mechanism that delivers power to a wheel of a human-powered vehicle to enable a human to exercise with less effort. See the top of column 2, Figure 6 and its discussion in column 6 at lines 31 et seq merely states that the battery that drives this system can be recharged by connecting a battery charger to a particular connector on the battery. Nothing indicates that the battery charger is the ultimate goal of the apparatus. Rather it is something that is connected externally to the motor to the battery of the drive system in order to get it ready for the next ride. On the other hand, applicant's apparatus works in the exact reverse. The generator is used to charge batteries, not a battery used to charge the motor of the apparatus. The Examiner has the situation reversed. Thus the Examiner's statement, "...to use an overprotection circuit and a charger for the purpose of enabling a high output power over long period of times as disclosed by Olsen..." is totally irrelevant to the nature of applicant's invention. Not only is it irrelevant, it is incorrect.

For example, applicant owns a cellular telephone. This cellular telephone contains a rechargeable battery. When one plugs in a built-in attachment to the telephone, and the

1 attachment is plugged into an AC outlet as well, the attachment can be used to recharge the
2 battery of the phone to enable continuous use of the telephone. But the battery of the telephone
3 is not used to power the attachment to the cell phone battery. That is the distinction between
4 applicant and *Olsen*.

5 The *Stern* device is strictly a flywheel that is rotated by the action of the pedals. The rear
6 wheel serves as a direct drive instrument to the generator 36. The generator 36 does not function
7 if someone is not riding the bicycle as the rear wheel 20 will not rotate. There is a direct
8 correlation to the operation of generator 36 to the rotation of the rear wheel 20. When one stops
9 the other stops. But in applicant's situation, the flywheel is used to create energy to power the
10 battery charger even if one is not pedaling. That is the advantage of a flywheel. Note also that
11 applicant's product is a totally stationary device. The front wheel is off the ground and the rear
12 wheel though rotating is within a framework such that it does not move from location one to
13 location two other than in a circular orbit. There is no distance traversed by the bicycle of
14 applicant. Such is not the case with the bicycles of *Olsen* and *Cheng-Yon*, both of which are
15 intended for motive power. *Molina* is also a bicycle intended to be ridden from location one to
16 location two. These four references cannot be combined because they do not meet the objective
17 of applicant.

18 Now let us look at the element of applicant's claim 4 in light of the apparatuses of the four
19 references cited. First, applicant has a stationary bike with three hubs. The *Stern* unit does not
20 have any type of motor connected to a hub that could constitute an intermediate hub rather belt
21 28 is mounted around the wheel at the rear of the bicycle said wheel designated 20.

22 In *Molina*, the dynamo is mounted on the intermediate hub whereas the dynamo of
23 applicant is in fact the rear wheel mounted on the rear hub but connected as well to the
24 intermediate hub. These structures are different. Note also that the dynamo of applicant not only
25 has a wheel that rotates, but it has a fixed housing. The housing having a series of peripherally
26 mounted, spaced magnets as in line 20 of claim 4 of the previous amendment. Such structure is
27 shown nowhere in any of the references cited by the Examiner. In essence, a review of Figure
28 2 shows that the rear wheel that rotates rotates relative to the rear housing having a fixed wheel,
29 similar information is discussed in amended claim 1 that says that a fixed wheel having a series
30 of peripherally mounted magnets and a rotatable wheel having a similar series peripherally
31 mounted like magnets in close proximity with the rotatable wheel being attached to the
32 intermediate hub.

33 The Examiner is also advised that the overprotection circuit of applicant is totally

1 different from the overprotection circuit of the cited references. Applicant's overprotection circuit
2 is for the benefit of the batteries being charged, which batteries are external and not connected
3 to the dynamo of the apparatus. This overprotection circuit acts as a one-way valve to have
4 electricity flow from the battery charger only to the batteries and not in return.

5 The Examiner is reminded also that the limitations found in claims 13-15 are not even
6 shown in the *Stern* reference, because *Stern* has the rear wheel propped up but the front wheel
7 can turn in any way, shape, or form, as may be desired. Applicant's front wheel is fixedly located.

8 The Examiner's attention is called to the limitation of the coaster clutch incorporated into
9 the intermediate hub, as per claim 10. The purpose of this coaster clutch is totally different from
10 the purpose of the clutch utilized in the *Cheng-Yon* apparatus. A clutch is not just a clutch just
11 like all roses are not alike. The clutch of applicant is used to permit the flywheel to continue to
12 rotate even if one is not pedaling whereas the clutch for *Cheng-Yon* is to prevent damage during
13 the course of connection and disconnection.

14 It is believed that all claims currently in the case are now patentable in light of the further
15 explanation of the apparatus of applicant as distinguished from those of the reference. Applicant
16 is not limited to the language, and counsel will consider slight amendments that might be deemed
17 beneficial by the Examiner in order to render the claims allowable in the mind of the Examiner.
18 The Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned with any further suggestions for language
19 modification.

20
21 Respectfully submitted,

22
23 FAX RECEIVED
24 JUL 07 2003
25 T.C. 2800

26
27 Mark C. Jacobs, 24043

28 Attorney for Applicant(s)

29
30
31
32
33
sactopat@aol.com

FAX RECEIVED
JUL 07 2003
T.C. 2800